REMARKS

Claims 8-11, 13 and 44-53 are pending. Claims 8, 44 and 49 are amended herein.

Support for the claim amendments can be found at least on page 26, lines 7-10, of the instant specification.

Examiner Interview

On July 28, 2005, Examiner Ke of the U.S. Patent Office and William Zarbis, Patent Agent for the Applicants, conducted a phone interview to discuss the cited prior art references in light of the claim amendments provided herein. The Applicants thank the Examiner for participating in the interview.

103 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 8-11, 13 and 44-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bendinelli et al. ("Bendinelli;" U.S. Patent No. 6,061,719) in view of Moraes (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,502) and further in view of Lemmons et al. ("Lemmons;" U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0034980). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 8-11, 13 and 44-53 is not shown or suggested by Bendinelli, Moraes and Lemmons, alone or in combination.

Embodiments in accordance with the present claimed invention pertain to methods and systems thereof in which a broadcaster sends program content – but not Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) associated with the program content – to a television set over a channel. The channel number is communicated from a set top box to a server computer system, which in turn uses the channel number to identify URLs associated with the program content that is being received at the television. The server in turn communicates one or more of those URLs to a computer system. Please see, for example, Figure 4D and the associated discussion in the instant application.

Applicants understand Bendinelli to teach a broadcaster that sends both a television signal and URLs corresponding to the picture portion of the signal. The URLs are transmitted to coincide with the content of the signal and may be embedded in the signal.

Applicants agree with the statements in the instant Office Action to the effect that Bendinelli does not show or suggest communicating URLs from a server to a computer system. The instant Office Action relies on Moraes to overcome this shortcoming. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Moraes does not overcome the shortcomings of Bendinelli.

First, Applicants understand Moraes to teach only that targeted advertisements are sent from a server to a client device. Applicants respectfully submit that Moraes does not show or suggest sending URLs from a server to a client device (or from a client to a server). Moraes refers to

banner advertisements 800 that may be interactive; however, as understood by the Applicants, the banner advertisements are stored locally in the memory of the client, and are not accessed by URLs.

Second, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine Bendinelli and Moraes. As mentioned above, according to Bendinelli, URLs are already delivered by the broadcaster. Hence, if for the sake of argument one presumes that Moraes teaches sending URLs from a server to a client, there is no motivation for an artisan at the time of the invention to consider combining Bendinelli and Moraes. Regarding the delivery of URLs related to broadcast content, Bendinelli is complete and functional in itself, and so there would be no reason to introduce Moraes.

Third, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bendinelli or Moraes nor the combination thereof show or suggest a mechanism that allows program content (absent URLs) that is received at one node (e.g., a television) to be married with related URLs that are at another node (e.g., a server), as recited by the claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that modifications to Bendinelli and Moraes are needed to meet the claims, but that neither Bendinelli or Moraes nor the combination thereof contain any suggestion that they be modified in the manner required to meet the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that, even if combined, Bendinelli and Moraes do not meet the claims.

Finally, Moraes appears to teach that user profile information is sent from the client to the server, and that the server uses the user profile

information to determine which advertisements are to be sent to the client. As mentioned above, Moraes does not show or suggest URLs. Bendinelli teaches URLs at a client and Moraes describes a user profile on a server, but neither Bendinelli or Moraes nor the combination thereof shows or suggests a mechanism by which Bendinelli's URLs can be acted on by Moraes' user profile. Again, Applicants respectfully submit that modifications to Bendinelli and Moraes are needed to meet the claims, that neither Bendinelli or Moraes nor the combination thereof contain any suggestion that they be modified in the manner required to meet the claims, and that as such Bendinelli and Moraes (alone or in combination) do not meet the claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bendinelli or Moraes, nor the combination thereof, show or suggest "a) receiving information at said server computer system via the Internet, said information comprising a channel number for a channel on which program content is being received by a television from a broadcaster wherein said broadcaster does not provide Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) corresponding to said program content, said channel number identified by a set top box coupled to said television and to the Internet, said channel number sent to said server computer system from said set top box; b) said server computer system using said channel number to identify a set of URLs for Web sites associated with said program content; and c) communicating one or more of said URLs from said server computer system to a computer system" as recited in independent Claims 8, 44 and 49.

Applicants further submit that Lemmons does not overcome the shortcomings of Bendinelli and Moraes. That is, Applicants respectfully submit that Lemmons, alone or in combination with Bendinelli and Moraes, does not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 8, 44 and 49 cited above.

In summary, Applicants respectfully maintain that Bendinelli, Moraes and Lemmons, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the embodiments of the present invention recited in independent Claims 8, 44 and 49, and that Claims 8, 44 and 49 are in condition for allowance. Also, Applicants respectfully submit that Bendinelli, Moraes and Lemmons, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 9-11, 13, 45-48 and 50-53 dependent on Claim 8, 44 or 49, and that Claims 9-11, 13, 45-48 and 50-53 are in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 8-11, 13 and 44-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 8-11, 13 and 44-53 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 7/29/05

William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060